

Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

DES/AzEIP used progress data from the reporting period to prepare its response for this indicator. The progress data were presented at a stakeholders' meeting on January 11, 2008 at which time improvement activities completed and to be completed were discussed.

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Indicator 3: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Measurement:

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):

- a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.

If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy):

- a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.

assessed)) times 100.

- d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers)}}{\text{(\# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)}} \right] \text{ times } 100.$
- e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers)}}{\text{(\# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)}} \right] \text{ times } 100.$

If $a + b + c + d + e$ does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:

- a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning)}}{\text{(\# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)}} \right] \text{ times } 100.$
- b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers)}}{\text{(\# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)}} \right] \text{ times } 100.$
- c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it)}}{\text{(\# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)}} \right] \text{ times } 100.$
- d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers)}}{\text{(\# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)}} \right] \text{ times } 100.$
- e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers)}}{\text{(\# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)}} \right] \text{ times } 100.$

If $a + b + c + d + e$ does not sum to 100%, explain the difference

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Arizona made two small changes to its process:

- Additional test instruments were added to the approved tool list.
- Formatting changes were made to the Child Indicator Summary Form to improve data collection.

Arizona adopted the ECO Center's Child Outcomes Summary Form and renamed it the Child Indicator Summary Form (CISF). Minor adaptations were made to the form to capture necessary demographic information and change the ratings from numbers to letters so children would not be rated a high or low number. The following is the State's description of its process:

Child Indicator Summary Entry Forms were to be completed for all infants and toddlers referred after June 15, 2006 who were (i) age 2.6 years or younger, (ii) eligible for AzEIP, and (iii) interested in early intervention and had an initial IFSP meeting. Programs could begin collecting exit data on December 15, 2006, which was six months after the first entry data could be collected, as children must have been receiving services for at least six consecutive months for data to be collected. Exit data is collected for a child who exits early intervention regardless of the reason, as long as the child meets the 6-month requirement. The exit rating is determined no later than 90 days prior to the child's transition/exit from early intervention.

The child's IFSP team, which includes the family, uses the 7-point Child Indicator Summary Form (CISF) to summarize outcome data from a variety of sources, including parent report, observation, a broad spectrum tool, other evaluation results, and available records. Arizona has approved certain broad spectrum tools that (i) ensure all areas of development are assessed, and (ii) have been, or are in the process of being, cross-walked by the ECO Center. Programs may choose any tool on the following list:

- The Ounce Scale
- Battelle Developmental Inventory - Second Edition
- Bayley Scales of Infant Development - Third Edition
- Brigance Diagnostic Inventory of Early Development - Second Edition
- Carolina Curriculum for Infants and Toddlers with Special Needs
- Developmental Assessment of Young Children (DAYC)
- Early Learning Accomplishment Profile (ELAP)
- Hawaii Early Learning Profile (HELP)
- Infant -Toddler Developmental Assessment (IDA) Record with Provence Birth-to-Three Developmental Profile
- Michigan Early Intervention Developmental Profile (MI EIDP)
- The Oregon Project for Visually Impaired and Blind Preschool Children Skills Inventory - Fifth Edition

All Initial Planning Process contractors and AzEIP service-providing agencies send completed entry and exit CISFs to the State office on a monthly basis via mail, fax, or e-mail. DES/AzEIP created a database for the child outcomes data, which is entered by DES/AzEIP staff as the forms are received from all contractors and agencies, except for the Division of Developmental Disabilities (DDD). DDD revised its database, FOCUS, to capture the child indicator data, and DDD service coordinators enter the data into FOCUS. DES/AzEIP receives FOCUS data containing the child indicator data from DDD on a monthly basis.

The DES/AzEIP database has been programmed using the ECO Center algorithms to calculate child progress. That database links to current data systems of the AzEIP service-providing agencies, to ensure necessary demographic information is captured. Using database information, the child's entry ratings are matched to the exit ratings and progress data is calculated using the algorithms. DDD service coordinators enter the data they collect into the DDD FOCUS system. DES/AzEIP downloads the data regularly to capture the child indicator entry and exit data. At this time, DES/AzEIP is not able to match the DDD FOCUS entry with the DDD exit data.

DES/AzEIP has adopted the ECO Center's form and, therefore, DES/AzEIP's definition for "comparable to same-aged peers" is a child who has been scored as an "E" or "T" on the form, which equates to ECO Center's 6 or 7.

SPP Template – Part C (3)

Arizona
State

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

DES/AzEIP will submit baseline data in 2010.

The first year of progress data for children exiting in 2006-2007 is presented in the tables below.

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):	Number of children	% of children
a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning.	2	9%
b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	2	9%
c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	4	18%
d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	7	32%
e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	7	32%
Total	N= 22	

B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication):	Number of children	% of children
a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning.	3	13.6%
b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	3	13.6%
c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	5	22.7%
d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	5	22.7%
e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	6	27.3%
Total	N= 22	

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:	Number of children	% of children
a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning.	2	9.1%
b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved	4	18.2%

functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.		
c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	4	18.2%
d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	6	27.2%
e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	6	27.2%
Total	N=22	

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Progress data reported in 2010 will be considered baseline data.

Progress Data:

Arizona began collecting entry data for all children made eligible after June 15, 2006 and six months later was able to begin collecting exit data. Progress data were available for 22 children during the possible six months of the reporting period. The length of time the 22 children participated in services ranged from 6 to 12 months, due to the limited time to measure data in this reporting period. Eighteen (18) of the 22 children in the data set had the entry rating when the child was between 25-30 months old and the other 4 children were between 19-24 months old.

Discussion of Progress Data:

DES/AzEIP captured data for 2,373 entry ratings during the reporting period received from all but one county, LaPaz. All but three programs submitted forms and those programs are in rural counties serving a small number of children and families. For a limited comparison of how many potential entry ratings could have been collected, DES/AzEIP conducted 4,825 initial IFSPs during the reporting period. This figure, however, includes children who would not have an entry rating because they were 2.6 years old or older. Also, there were potentially children who left the program prior to completing six months in the program and, therefore, would not have exit data.

Also contributing to the low number of children was the fact that there were an additional 129 children with exit ratings in DDD's FOCUS database who could not be matched to entry ratings, so progress data was not captured. DES/AzEIP is not yet able to match the FOCUS data with its entry data to capture progress data, but is developing a process and program to match the entry and exit ratings for each child as an additional improvement activity, with an anticipated completion date of June 2008. Due to the challenges involved in capturing progress data in the FOCUS database, DES/AzEIP has required all DDD service coordinators to submit the completed CISFs to DES/AzEIP in addition to entering the data into FOCUS.

Another reason for the low number of children for whom progress data were available was the failure of a large DES/AzEIP contractor to complete entry ratings for a period of three months. To resolve this issue, DES Office of Procurement issued a Demand for Assurance to this contractor in October 2006 on this issue, and the contractor subsequently began completing the forms.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	<i>NA for this reporting period. Targets will be set in 2010.</i>
2006 (2006-2007)	<i>NA for this reporting period. Targets will be set in 2010.</i>
2007 (2007-2008)	
2008 (2008-2009)	
2009 (2009-2010)	
2010 (2010-2011)	

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Status
In collaboration with staff from the ECO Center, DES/AZEIP provided Child Outcomes Trainings for AZEIP IPP contractors and service-providing agencies involved in the collection of entry data.	May 2006	Initial training completed 2006. Ongoing TA provided periodically and as needed.
Telephone conference with staff from the ECO Center, to address issues and concerns as programs began to use the tools and forms.	September 2006	Completed
An iTV (interactive instructional TV) training for all agencies involved in the on-going services to children who would be involved in exit ratings.	November 2006	Completed
Training for approximately 60 service coordinators in Maricopa County.	December 2006	Completed
Onsite monitoring visits for Cycle 4 (Pinal, Gila, Graham, Greenlee, and Cochise Counties) was	March – May 2007	Completed

SPP Template – Part C (3)

Arizona
State

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Status
provided on the child indicator forms and process. Non-compliance was included in the program's Correction Action Plan.		
DES/AzEIP developed a new database to calculate the measurements required for this Indicator. DES/AzEIP Staff enters the child's I.D. from the CISF sent to the office and the field is populated with demographic information from AzEIP's ACTS database. The entry ratings are then entered into the database. When entering an exit rating, the exit rating is matched to the entry rating, allowing progress data to be calculated.	June 2006 – December 2006	Completed
DES/AzEIP published for public comment and thereafter revised its monitoring policy to incorporate the child indicators into its policies and procedures. In addition, new contracts procured from DES/AzEIP will expressly include the procedures for completing the CISF.	April 2007	Completed
DES/AzEIP works closely with AzEIP service-providing agencies to ensure that the necessary data elements needed for the new database are entered into the current data systems. The programs are encouraged to monitor their data system on at least a monthly basis, to ensure accurate and timely data collection.	August 2007 - 2010	Completed with DDD in September 2007. Work continues with ASDB.
Regional TAMS provided support on the child indicators in Yuma and on the Navajo Nation.	August – December 2007	Completed
DES/AzEIP is developing a data-handling plan, which includes a regular review (at least bi-annually) of the child indicator data. Through this review, DES/AzEIP will determine which programs are not submitting the CISFs to the DES/AzEIP office and provide technical assistance to ensure the forms are submitted.	October 2007 – September 2008	In progress. Data reviews occurring bi-annually.
DES/AzEIP will develop a mechanism to match the exit ratings for children entered in DDD's FOCUS with the entry rating that was entered into DES/AzEIP child indicator database.	May – December 2008	To begin May 2008
DES/AzEIP will conduct a regular review of the data, at least biannually, to identify needed technical assistance. DES/AzEIP will compare the number of eligible children with the number of data entry forms it receives and the number of children exiting the program with the number of exit forms it receives.	December 2007 - 2010	Implemented in December 2007
DES/AzEIP will continue the onsite technical assistance to programs during monitoring visits and support local programs to review random samples of the CISFs for accuracy and completeness.	January 2008 and ongoing	In progress

SPP Template – Part C (3)

Arizona
State

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Status
DES/AzEIP will include an opportunity for questions and answers during the regional quarterly meetings and provide technical assistance.	July 2008 and ongoing	To begin July 2008
DES/AzEIP will review a random sample of CISFs and compare with the database to reduce errors.	Quarterly beginning June 2008 and ongoing	To begin June 2008

The State's complete State Performance Plan is available on its website, www.azdes.gov/azeip under "Publications and Reports."